

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 E. K. WADE,  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 WILLIAM H. ALSUP, et al.,  
11 Defendants.

Case No. 20-mc-80181-EMC

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE**

12  
13 The Court recently dismissed two lawsuits initiated by Plaintiff against judges in this  
14 District, Ninth Circuit judges, and USAO attorneys. *See Wade v. Alsup*, No. 20-mc-80167 EMC  
15 (N.D. Cal.) (Docket No. 5); *Wade v. Alsup*, No. 20-mc-80178 EMC (N.D. Cal.) (Docket No.  
16 4). In the instant case, Plaintiff again sues the same defendants based on the same underlying  
17 facts.

18 The Court rules consistent with its orders in the two above-referenced cases. That is, the  
19 Court has reviewed the complaint and finds that it does not state a potentially cognizable  
20 claim. Therefore, in accordance with the Order filed on June 24, 2010, in *Wade v. Gilliland*, No.  
21 C-10-0425 WHA (N.D. Cal.), the Clerk is directed not to accept the complaint for filing and this  
22 action is dismissed.

23  
24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: October 14, 2020

26  
27  
28   
EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge